

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 4, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1 and 11 are hereby amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahan (GB 2,325,329A) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,800,375 to Silverstein et al. (hereinafter "Silverstein"), and Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahan in view of Silverstein, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,253 to Hiroki (hereinafter "Hiroki")

The rejection of the pending claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahan in view of Silverstein is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 is allowable over the cited references including Ahan and Silverstein in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "consecutively providing the color data signals having a same color to the demultiplexer unit by the driver; and consecutively providing the color data signals having a same color to non-adjacent data lines by the demultiplexer unit before applying a different color data signal to any of the data lines by the demultiplexer unit."

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Ahan does not teach "consecutively providing the color data signals having a same color to the demultiplexer unit by the driver; and consecutively providing the color data signals having a same color to non-adjacent data lines by the demultiplexer unit" and cites Silverstein as curing this deficiency in the teachings of Ahan. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion regarding the teachings of Silverstein.

In particular, the Examiner cites Fig. 2B and column. 2, line 64-column 3, lines 12 of Silverstein as showing "consecutively providing the color data signals having a same color to non-adjacent data lines by the demultiplexer unit." Applicants submit that even if the Examiner is correct, Silverstein does not show at least "consecutively providing the color data signals having a same color to non-adjacent data lines by the demultiplexer unit before applying a

different color data signal to any of the plurality of data lines to any of the data lines by the demultiplexer unit.” For example in FIG. 2B, the pixels of the same color are adjacent, and neither FIG. 2B, nor the associated text in Silverstein teach or suggest “consecutively providing the color data signals having a same color to non-adjacent data lines by the demultiplexer unit before applying a different color data signal to any of the data lines by the multiplexer unit.”

Applicants submit that no portion of Silverstein, including the portions cited by the Examiner cures the deficiency in the teachings of Ahan regarding the combined features of claim 1 identified above. Accordingly, Ahan and Silverstein, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 11 recites a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “a data driving unit, a liquid crystal panel having a plurality of data lines and a demultiplexer unit connected between a data driving circuit and the liquid crystal panel and distributing color data signals from any one of the output terminals of the data driving circuit to the plurality of the data lines on the liquid crystal panel” and wherein “wherein the data driver consecutively provides the color data signals having a same color to the demultiplexer unit, and the demultiplexer unit consecutively provides the color data signals having a same color to non-adjacent data lines before applying a different color signal to any of the data lines.”

Applicants submit that Ahan and Silverstein, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above combination of features recited in claim 11 for at least the same reasons discussed above for claim 1.

Applicants further note that claims 2-5, 7-10, depend from claim 1, and that 12-14, and 17-20 depend 11. Applicants submit that claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-14, and 17-20 are allowable over Ahan and Silverstein at least based on their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 11, and for the reasons discussed above for claims 1 and 11.

Accordingly, Applicants respectively request that rejection of claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as unpatentable over Ahan in view of Silverstein, and further in view of Hiroki is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As to dependent claims 6 and 16, these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. Hiroki does not cure the deficiencies of Ahan and Silverstein. Hence, Ahan,

Silverstein et al and Hiroki, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 6 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectively request that the rejection of claims 6 and 16 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: **January 3, 2008**

By: Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants